



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,694	08/05/2005	Thomas Levy	Q88874	1929
23373	7590	04/12/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			NEURAUTER, GEORGE C	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2443	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte THOMAS LEVY and OLIVIER MARCE

Appeal 2010-000512
Application 10/541,694
Technology Center 2400

Mailed: April 12, 2010

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Division 2 Support Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on October 20, 2009. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal Number 2010-000512 was assigned on October 23, 2009. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Appeal 2010-000512
Application 10/541,694

Claims 1, 2, and 4 of the instant application contain functional language that may be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. *See Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed Cir. 2008); *Ex parte Rodriguez*, 92 USPQ2d 1395 (BPAI 2009). On September 2, 2008, the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when examining means (or step) plus function claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph,” located at: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognitice/section_112_6_th_09_02_2008.pdf. Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 1, 2, and 4, and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of being definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 1, 2, and 4, and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

babc

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037